



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

satisfaction, universal reassurance, and confident hope," leaves Paris for the United States.

June 29.—German evangelical churches set apart Sunday, July 6, as a day of mourning on account of the peace treaty.

President Wilson sails from Brest.

June 30.—A new council of Four is formed in Paris, consisting of Mr. Pichon for France, Mr. Lansing for the United States, Mr. Balfour for Great Britain, and Mr. Tittoni for Italy.

July 3.—The text of the agreement between the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and France, providing for immediate assistance for France in case of an unprovoked act of aggression on the part of Germany, is given out by the foreign office in Paris.

July 6.—Austria asks that she be admitted to the League of Nations upon its signing of the peace.

July 8.—President Wilson arrives in Washington by way of New York. The Adriatic question again to the fore in Paris.

July 9.—Resolutions ratifying the peace treaty are adopted by the German National Assembly at Weimar, by a vote of 208 to 115. The text of the ratification resolutions contains two clauses as follows:

"The peace treaty between Germany and the allied and associated powers signed on June 28, 1919, as the protocol belonging thereto, as well as the agreement relative to the occupation of the Rhineland, signed the same day, are agreed to.

"This law comes into force on the day of its promulgation."

Most of the Ministers and all of the Deputies were present at the meeting. Dr. Müller, Minister of Foreign Affairs, said: "We are about to enter upon a forty years' march through a desert. I can find no other terms for the path of suffering the fulfillment of the treaty prescribes for us." The leader of the Catholic Centre Party, Dr. Peter Spahn, said: "We agreed to the treaty under hard compulsion, to save ourselves from anarchy and to preserve the Fatherland from internal ruin." A number of speeches violently protested against the injustice of the treaty and the impossibility of its fulfillment, and declaring that the day of Germany's liberation would come.

July 10.—President Wilson receives the newspaper men and presents the treaty of peace to the Senate.

July 12.—Commercial relations between France and Germany resumed.

## INTERNATIONAL NOTES

**The Irish Republic's President**, prior to his secret departure for the United States, where he has been resorting to propaganda labors during the past month and where, considering his peculiar status, he has been the recipient of extraordinary favors and courtesies from public officials, national, State and municipal, joined with his associates in sending to the Peace Conference at Paris the following letter:

MANSION HOUSE, DUBLIN,  
May 26, 1919.

M. Georges Clemenceau, President of the Peace Conference,  
Paris.

SIR:

On May 17 we forwarded to you a note requesting you to warn the conference that the Irish people will not be bound by the signatures of English or British delegates to the conference, inasmuch as these delegates do not represent Ireland.

We now further request that you will provide an opportunity for the consideration by the conference of Ireland's claim to be recognized as an independent sovereign State.

We send you herewith a general memorandum on the case and beg to direct your attention in particular to the following.

1. That the rule of Ireland by England has been and is now intolerable; that it is contrary to all conceptions of liberty and justice, and as such, on the ground of humanity alone, should be ended by the conference.

2. That the declared object of the conference is to establish a lasting peace, which is admittedly impossible if the legitimate claims of self-determination of nations, such as Ireland, is denied.

3. That incorporated with the Peace Treaty under consideration is a covenant establishing a League of Nations intended among other things to confirm and perpetuate the political relations and conditions established by the treaty. It is clear that it is radically unjust to seek to confirm and perpetuate what is essentially wrong, and that it is indefensible to refuse an examination of title when a confirmation of possession is intended such as that provided by the draft covenant of the League of Nations.

Ireland definitely denies that England or Britain can show just claim or title to hold or possess Ireland, and demands an opportunity for her representatives to appear before the conference to refute any such claim.

We feel that these facts are sufficient basis to merit for our request the consideration which we are sure you, Sir, will give them.

Please accept, Mr. President, the assurance of our great esteem.

EAMONN DE VALERA.  
ARTHUR GRIFFITH.  
GEORGE NOBLE.

(Count Plunkett.)

This communication had no perceptible effect upon the body to which it was addressed, and, together with other documents of a similar tenor addressed more specifically to President Wilson and to the American Peace delegation, was left in the hands of the President of the Conference, M. Clemenceau, when the American executive left Paris for home, June 29.

**The cost of the war to the United States**, down to May 31, as estimated by the statistics branch of the General Staff of the Army, had been \$21,850,000,000,

of which \$13,930,000,000 had been spent on the army. In addition nearly \$10,000,000,000 had been loaned. The number of soldiers who were transported to France was 2,084,000, and of these 1,390,000 saw active service. The total deaths in the army and navy, then reported, had been 122,500; and where one had been killed, seven had been wounded. But of the latter a great majority had been cured and had returned to duty. Expressed in terms of percentage, for every 100 soldiers, marines, and sailors who served in the war, ninety-eight per cent escaped disease, wounds, and death. But viewing the war as a whole and including the casualties of all the nations, it is estimated that more lives were lost than in all the wars from 1814 to 1914. Appraised from another standpoint, the American bill of costs in terms of money is approximately as large as the sum expended for the Government of the republic from 1791 to 1914; and the army alone, during 1914-18, cost nearly as much as the value of all the gold mined in the world since 1492. As for the leading nations involved in the war, their total expenditure up to June 1, has been \$186,000,000,000; Germany leading with 39, Great Britain following with 38, and the others in this order: France, 26; United States, 22; Austria-Hungary, 21; Russia, 18; Italy, 13; Belgium, Roumania, Portugal, and Jugo-Slavia, 5; Turkey and Bulgaria, 2; and Japan and Greece one billion dollars. Of deaths in battle Russia is estimated to have had 1,700,000; Germany, 1,600,000; France, 1,385,300; Great Britain, 900,000; Austria, 800,000; Italy, 330,000; Turkey, 250,000; Serbia and Montenegro, 125,000; Belgium, 102,000; Roumania, 100,000; Bulgaria, 100,000, the United States, 48,900; Greece, 7,000; and Portugal, 2,000, or a total of 7,450,200. It is because of facts like these and others equally portentous, that the civilian, non-combatant inhabitants of all the continents are today facing costs of living, burdens of taxation, and tangled problems of personal as well as communal finance, that breed pessimism, propagate anarchy, and drive individuals to suicide and nations back to semi-barbarism.

**Latin-America's attitude toward the League of Nations**, broadly speaking, may be inferred fairly well by the reply of the National Administrative Council of Uruguay to the query of the President of that republic, as to whether the nation should become a party to the compact. Assenting, the Council said:

"The deterrent example of the recent European convulsion has inspired the conscience and the heart of all statesmen of the present day with the supreme desire to create, at all costs, an efficient formula, supported by some higher force which shall be above all national power and constitute a guarantee of peace and justice to all mankind."

That Brazil, also, is similarly inclined, has been shown by the words of her president-elect, during his recent tour of the United States; and also by the active part played by her in the Paris deliberations and the major place conceded to her in the League. That some of the States have had their desires unfulfilled at Paris is evident from the position of Honduras, made known formally to the Peace Conference in a memorandum filed by General Policarpo Bonilla, head of the Honduranian delegation, in which the request was made that since the

Conference was to make a reference to the Monroe Doctrine and, as it were, was to give it an international status, it was its duty to define the same before making it a part of international law. Honduras, like many other nations to the south, would be able to act with greater certitude in the future did she know just which variant of the "doctrine" is authoritative, that of Monroe, Cleveland, or Wilson. General Bonilla also announced that Honduras would only sign the treaty subject to a reservation permitting that State to join with other nations in forming ultimately the Republic of Central America.

Yet another point of view among the Latin-Americans finds expression in the opinions of Romulo S. Naon, former Argentine Ambassador to the United States, undoubtedly one of the ablest and most experienced statesmen of the group of men who have made the Argentine Republic a major power. He deprecates the Peace Conference's drafting of an international league which discriminates between the large and small powers, and which has given so little heed to the neutral nations in settling the problems of the present and future. He speaks not for the present government of the Argentine, but for the Argentine people, who were for the Allies. It also is worth noting that he believes that "aloofness from European affairs by the United States would be far better for Pan-Americanism than the participation of the United States in foreign politics at the expense of Pan-Americanism."

**Forts and barracks**, in number more than four-score, now line the border between the United States and Mexico. They have been swiftly built since the armistice was signed last November, and they have been constructed, in the main, out of material used in the camps of the south used while the American Expeditionary Force was being trained for Europe, some of the largest of these stations being in Texas. Of these outpost positions, symbols of past and present friction and possible future war, there are five in California, six in Arizona, and the others are in Texas. Over against this state of affairs, consider the other and more cheering fact that nothing of the kind exists along the northern boundary of the United States, nor has for a century. In justification of the newly created situation in the south it will be urged that the three-year watch of the American troops along the Mexican front, maintained often under most unfortunate conditions and detrimental to the physical and mental morale of the "regulars" and the national guard, have forced upon the War Department a decision that otherwise might not have been made. Up to a certain point there is something to be said for this plea. So far as the new outposts have to do with better housing, with provision for recreation and all that is implied in "war camp community" work, there can be no adverse criticism. There, as elsewhere, wherever the American soldier goes in the future, he is to have schools, canteens and protection from the harpies that in days gone by have always grown rich on the carnal appetites of officers and privates. But it is to be hoped that these outposts are not to become arsenals, heavily armed and flaunting symbols of the might of the

nation that builds them. There already are a sufficient number of inflammables along this border, awaiting but a spark to set them off, without adding to the supply. Mexico, as she becomes more stable and powerful, may logically argue, that her "national interests" demand construction of a similar chain of military outposts along her northern border. Then the chances of war between the two peoples will be raised to the nth power. There have been times in the clashings between London and Washington over issues centering in Ottawa, when, if the border between the Dominion and the Republic had been fortified and the Great Lakes had had rival police fleets, passion might not have been subject to reason.

**The League of Friends of Korea**, with headquarters at Washington and with rapidly multiplying branches throughout the United States, has secured as head of its organization Rear Admiral Watson, U. S. N. It plans to disseminate information respecting Korea's treatment by Japan, to organize the Christian sentiment of the republic in favor of protection to Christians who are being persecuted, and to do all that may be done legitimately to assist the cause of Korean freedom. Agitation, by the printed and the spoken word, is to be the instrument used, and, taking a leaf out of the book of the Irish republican movement, there is to be pressure on Congress and the President. Advantage is to be taken of a widespread interest in the welfare of "little peoples" that has come since the shibboleth of "self-determination" was proclaimed in high places; and there is a natural expectation by the Koreans and by their American defenders and champions that the more light the public gets on the inwardness of the Shantung award and the part that "secret treaties" played in determining the settlement of Far Eastern questions by the Paris Conference, the stronger will be the reaction in favor of Korea and her claims. The fact that branches of the League are most numerous now on the Pacific coast among people who, for reasons of their own, are anti-Japanese, and on the Atlantic coast where the great Christian missionary interests center, is in itself significant. In some respects the most important personal identification with the aims of the League that has been chronicled is that of William Eliot Griffis, author of the "Mikado's Empire" and other standard books on Japan, who was one of the first Americans to be employed by Japan as an educator and who always has been and still is her faithful, though candid, friend. He also knows the Koreans, their ancient "cultur" and the debt that Japan owes the venerable "Hermit Kingdom." He is now unequivocally condemning the "Prussianizing" methods that Japan is using toward a subject race in an effort of enforced assimilation.

**German resistance** to the Poles' share of the former empire assigned by the Allied and Associated Powers under the Paris Treaty, having been planned and announced in communications which came into the Powers' hands even before the treaty was signed, the President of the Conference sent to the German officials the following communication, showing that the treaty was to have teeth. The German plan was outlined in the following intercepted letter:

"POSEN, June 21, 1919.

"The Government will sign. Nevertheless, Horsing (Provincial President) will proclaim for Silesia, and Wig (Provincial President) for Western and Eastern Prussia, war against the East. The Government will officially declare its opposition, but will unofficially support the action by every means.

"Horsing has telegraphed today: Send my large parcel to Breslau."

Upon this communication, M. Clemenceau, for his associates, commented thus:

PARIS, June 25.

"MR. PRESIDENT:

"The Allied and Associated Powers feel it necessary to direct the attention of the German Government to the fact that the Polish authorities have come into possession of the attached official German dispatch which states that while the German Government mean to sign the peace, they intend to give unofficial support by all the means in their power to local movements of resistance to the establishment of Polish authority in the territories allotted to Poland in Posen, and in East and West Prussia, and to the occupation of upper Silesia by the Allied and Associated Powers.

"In view of this information the Allied and Associated Powers think it necessary to inform the German Government that they will hold them strictly responsible for seeing that at the time indicated in the treaty all troops and all officials indicated by the Allied Commission, are withdrawn, and that in the event of local disturbances in resistance to the treaty no support or assistance to the insurgents is allowed to pass across the new frontier into Poland.

"G. CLEMENCEAU."

**The Executive Committee of the International League of Nations Conference**, with headquarters at Berne, Switzerland, have recently issued a manifesto relating to the League of Nations Covenant, which reads:

The last events at the Peace Conference and the publication of the League of Nations Covenant induce us to appeal once more to the sense of responsibility of governments of peoples.

We abstain from expressing any opinion about Fiume itself. We only consider it our right to say that no durable peace is possible unless the right of nations to decide freely about their own fate is loyally applied to all cases of opposed aspirations, without any exception whatever.

Many difficulties that seem at the present to stand in the way of an honest application of this principle would vanish by the establishment of a real, universal League of Nations, taking away the strategical, and economic importance of frontiers and securing to every country unimpeded access to the open sea and international protection of national minorities.

We cannot abstain from saying that the Paris Covenant does not express in all points our ideal of the League of Nations. The preponderant power of five States in the Executive, the insufficient provisions about economic freedom and disarmament, the rejecting of the French and Japanese amendments about stronger guarantees against aggression and about racial equality, all that is to be regretted. Besides, no League of Nations can be effective without an independent Council

of Conciliation, as proposed by the official drafts of Swiss, Dutch and Scandinavian experts and that of the German Government, neither without a world parliament and international guarantees for national minorities, as also proposed by the German draft. We recognize the realization of the Paris Covenant is already an advance. But we understand that this League of Nations is not universally accepted as a sufficiently strong safeguard to replace the traditional guarantees.

Therefore we, who have propagated President Wilson's principles from the very day they were promulgated, we appeal to all those who share these convictions, to strengthen their endeavors for the development of the Paris Covenant in democratic spirit.

Then all territorial problems can find a fair solution and the world will be saved from the chaos which is threatening the very foundations of our civilization, if the trust in President Wilson and his principles would get lost.

**Twenty-three wars**, according to the Chief of the British staff, are now actually in progress. We do not know what wars the British officer had in mind, but the *New York Times* figures them out as follows:

- 1, Great War, Allied Powers versus Central Powers;
- 2, Yugoslavia versus Austria;
- 3, Roumania versus Hungary and Bolsheviks;
- 4, Poland versus Ukraine;
- 5, Letts and Balts versus Bolsheviks;
- 6, Estonians versus Bolsheviks;
- 7, Deniken versus Bolsheviks;
- 8, Finns versus Russian Bolsheviks;
- 9, Allies versus Bolsheviks;
- 10, Kolchak versus Bolsheviks;
- 11, Persia versus Kurds;
- 12, Germans versus Bolsheviks;
- 13, Cossacks versus Bolsheviks;
- 14, Afghans versus British;
- 15, Siberians versus Bolsheviks;
- 16, Egyptians versus British;
- 17, Nicaragua versus Costa Rica;
- 18, Mexican Troubles;
- 19, Irish versus British;
- 20, Hedjas versus Bedouins;
- 21, Chinese Revolution;
- 22, Czechs versus Hungary;
- 23, Poland versus Bolsheviks.

## BOOK REVIEWS

**THE NEMESIS OF DEMOCRACY.** By *Ralph Adams Cram*. Marshall Jones Company, Boston. Pp. 58. \$1.00

A third printing of this iconoclastic essay indicates that it must make its appeal to a considerable constituency of sceptics who distrust democracy's influence on humanity, especially in its seeming or actual sterilizing effect. The thesis of the book is that as the basis of government becomes broader the number of outstanding leaders seems to or does diminish. This American champion of the Carlylean theory of the "great man" scheme of society is a New Englander, who is renowned as an architect, as a champion of Gothic architecture still suited for use in ecclesiastical and academic structures, and as a town-planner. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that he annually mourns the execution of Charles I of England, and that he belongs to the order of the faithful who keep alive the regret that the Stuarts passed from the British throne. Democratic grapes would hardly be expected to grow on such an autocratic thistle. Mr. Cram is candid enough to admit, in a postscript to this latest edition of his book, that he erred in his depreciation of Clemenceau; that in the King of the Belgians and in Marshal Joffre, Marshal Foch and General Pershing, men of action have loomed up who must be reckoned with. Indeed, he seems to find the only ray of hope for an aimless drifting world, in the men in high and low places who have fought with carnal weapons and made

military records. This is not surprising, for since 1914 he has been one of the fiercest of the Bostonian lusters for war with Germany. What Hillis, the preacher, and Beck, the lawyer, have been to their callings he has been among artists.

**BISMARCK.** By *C. Grant Robertson*, Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. Henry Holt & Co., N. Y. City. Pp. 512, with appendices and bibliography. \$2.25 net.

This latest contribution to the makers of the Nineteenth Century series, edited by Basil Williams, raises the average of the collection considerably; and it was high previously. Publication comes at "the psychological moment," to use a somewhat overworked phrase. Substantially completed prior to the war, it is not marred by marks of hate or passion. What was written has been allowed to stand. Occasionally, of course, a moral is pointed and the tale adorned by the grim facts of 1914-18, facts which show the logical sequence in the realm of morals as applied to statecraft, when "blood and iron" become the symbols of national life.

But, broadly speaking, the British scholar has been both shrewd and kind enough to let the reader make his own deductions in the realm of applied ethics. He, the biographer, has accumulated the facts, conjectured the motives, judged the deeds—open and secret—and contrasted the career of the "Iron Chancellor" with that of other statesmen of his time, leaving it to a defeated Germany and the victorious world beyond to decide just how far the man was responsible for the military and social debacle of the present hour. If Germany in 1890, as he contends, had placed Bismarck with Luther, Frederick the Great, and Goethe as her greatest figures since the Renaissance, will she continue so as a socialistic republic under bonds to keep the peace for an indefinite number of years?

The merit of this book is triple. It combines fullness and accuracy of information to a degree that would satisfy a Mommsen or a Freeman, with a style and readability that recall the art of Macaulay and Froude, and at the same time it is crowned by a judicial quality which none of them possessed. So blessed, the book comes at a most opportune time, for it is already apparent that with the signing of the peace treaty major and minor figures in German history are to blossom forth with books of reminiscence, exposure of policies of state under William II, and defence of their own or their fathers' careers. Many of these books will shed light on the last years of Bismarck's life, his responsibility for the war with France in 1870, his break with William II, and his lack of sympathy with the Pan-German scheme that finally drew Germany into aggressive madness. For all persons who wish to connect present and coming "literature of disclosure" with the sordid and secret past of Bismarck's tortuous reign, during which he toyed with Austrian, French, British and Italian foreign ministers, this volume will be useful. He died wishing no other epitaph on his tomb than one telling of his loyalty to William I, King of Prussia. If he had been equally loyal to humanity in general and to Germany as a whole, if he had had faith in democracy, if his God had been a universal Being and not a tribal Deity, the world would have been saved millions of lives, billions of wealth, and untold, indescribable anguish. He both symbolized and used titanic power while he lived; and as such an incarnation he used race pride, economic need, lust for territory, and Teutonic hate of the Gaul and the Briton, to rear a vast state structure, now shattered. Incidentally he brought upon his countrymen a final shame and world contempt; and it is going to be worth noting how raidily Germans who are Teutons will join with Maximilian Harden, the Jew with a conscience, in thus rating the demigod of yesterday. Surely neither the Socialists nor the Centrists now in the saddle are likely to pay reverence to the memory of the man who was their bitterest foe.

**WAR AND EDUCATION.** By *Andrew F. West*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J. Pp. 87. \$1.00 net.

The dean of the Graduate School at Princeton University has long been an able, constant, unsparing critic of tend-